

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 12, 14, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly met by Feng.

Claim 1 is directed to a coded image capture and decoding system. Claim 1 recites, among other elements, "a first processing circuit, coupled to the optical system, that generates a plurality of images based on image data received from the optical system[.]" Additionally, Claim 1 recites "a second processing circuit, coupled to the image buffer, that, after the plurality of images are stored in the image buffer, attempts decode processing of the plurality of images."

The Office Action states that the element of "a first processing circuit, coupled to the optical system, that generates a plurality of images based on image data received from the optical system" is found within Feng, from column 10, line 53 to column 11, line 39. The Office Action also asserts that the second processing circuit is contained within Feng, from column 12, lines 1-9 and 55-67.

However, closer examination of the cited portions within Feng reveals that the element of the "second processing circuit, coupled to the image buffer, that, after the plurality of images are stored in the image buffer, attempts decode processing of the plurality of images" is not supported by the appropriate citation within Feng. Feng at the cited reference, "includes decoding circuitry 292 for decoding a dataform represented *in the captured frame*." Further, Feng goes on to state that "[t]he decoding circuitry 292 operates on *a stored frame of image data* to extract data from cell data ... and decode[s] the cell data." Thus, Feng only operates on a single stored frame at a time.

Claim 2 recites a "second processing circuit constructs a composite image from the plurality of images for decode processing." The Office Action asserts that this is found in Feng

at column 12, lines 10-54. A closer reading of the cited selection reveals that Feng's invention performs *compensation* on a *single "captured frame from the frame color buffer memory."* (Feng, column 12, lines 14-15). As such, Feng does not "*construct a composite image* from the *plurality of images* for decode processing."

Claim 4 recites that the "first processing circuit performs proximity screening of the image data from the optical system." The Office Action asserts that Feng includes such circuit at column 15, line 63 to column 16, line 5.

A closer examination of Feng at the cited reference shows that Feng only checks the parameters of the decoder system that need adjusting, such as lighting. Feng does not perform proximity screening functions, such as, for example, "detect[ing] ... any proximate object" and "evaluat[ing] ... the proximate object's image to determine whether the object is most likely a coded target" (Specification, line 15). As such, Feng does not perform nor suggest "proximity screening of the image data from the optical system."

Claim 6 that the coded image capturing decoding system further comprises "a proximity circuit which detects the presence of the coded target and initiates capture cycling." In a manner similar to that of claim 4, a closer examination of Feng reveals that no circuit within Feng performs or suggests a circuit that performs the proximity functions.

Independent Claim 8 recites, among other elements, an "image processing circuit that generates a plurality of coded images", "an image buffer ... that stores the plurality of coded images generated by the image processing circuit", and a "host processing circuit that performs decode processing of coded images." A reading of the portions of Feng cited in the Office Action reveal that Feng does not reveal or suggest these elements.

In fact, Feng apparently teaches away from these elements. Feng, at item 402, Fig. 14, reveals a step of “captur[ing an] image of the target area and store in the color frame buffer[.]” At column 12, lines 1-10, the cited art reveals that “[c]ontrol and selection circuitry 284 . . . receives successive image frames *temporarily* stored in the frame buffer memory 274.” Thus, the frame buffer memory does not store a “plurality of coded images generated by the image processing circuit.”

Claim 12 recites the element where " proximity screening rules are applied by the image processing circuit." As stated before, in relation to claims 4 and 6, Feng does not disclose this element. Feng does not check the target to determine whether to perform a decode based upon the composition of the image. Nor does Feng suggest these functions.

Claim 17 recites the element in which the image capture and decoding system further comprises "interface circuitry that assists in delivering the plurality of images to the host processing circuit", and the host processing circuit "decodes [the plurality of images] after the plurality of images have been stored in the image buffer." The Office Action asserts that these elements are met by Feng.

A closer reading of the relevant portions of Feng, as described in the Applicants' traversal of claims 1, 2, and 8, indicates that Feng's decoding takes place after a single image has been temporarily stored in the frame buffer memory and moved to the control and selection circuitry. In contradistinction, the claimed invention recites that the decoding take place "after the *plurality of images* have been stored in the image buffer."

Accordingly, the claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 12, 14, and 15-17 are allowable over Feng. Applicants accordingly request withdrawal of these rejections. Further, as claims 1, 8, and 15

are independent claims, all depending claims should be allowed as depending upon allowable claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 3, 13, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly met by Feng in view of the admitted prior art. The admitted prior art is insufficient to overcome the deficiencies of Feng.

Claim 3 recites that the "plurality of images constitutes a predetermined number of images." The Office Action states that this element is admitted in the prior art and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of the admitted prior art to Feng's system.

Applicants strenuously object to the mischaracterization of the admitted prior art. The admitted prior art shows that a predefined number of failed decoding attempts may trigger the end of an attempt at decoding the image. This has nothing to do with predefined number of images making up a decoding attempt. Thus, equating a predefined number of failed decoding attempts to end an attempt to decode an image to the "storing of a plurality of images, where[] the plurality of images constitutes a predetermined number of images" is not proper.

Thus, the admitted prior art does not teach, nor does it suggest the element of "the plurality of images constitut[ing] a predetermined number of images." Thus, the Office Action fails to make a *prima facie* case for obviousness under §103.

Claim 13 recites a related element where "the image processing circuit attempts to generate a predetermined number of coded images." This rejection, in equating an "image processing circuit attempt[ing] to generate a predetermined number of coded images" to a

predefined number of failed decoding attempts, is respectfully traversed. The admitted prior art does not teach, nor does it suggest the element of "the plurality of images constitut[ing] a predetermined number of images." As with Claim 3, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made in the Office Action for Claim 13.

Claim 18 recites the element where "the interface circuitry utilizes wireless transmissions in the delivery of the plurality of images to the host processing circuit" for decoding by the host processing circuit. The Office Action asserts that multiple images are wirelessly transferred to a remote site for further processing, based on the admitted prior art. However, the prior art does not teach nor does it suggest that these plurality of images are used in the determination of a single decoded image.

Accordingly, Claims 3, 13, and 18 are allowable over Feng in view of the admitted prior art and Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 7 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly met by Feng in view of Park (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,424). Park is insufficient to overcome the deficiencies of Feng.

Claim 10 recites the element of "at least one of the plurality of coded images constitutes a reference image" and "at least one other [coded image] constitutes a plurality of differences based on comparison with the reference image." However, in no place does a reading of Park reveal or suggest the element wherein "at least one of the plurality of coded images constitutes a reference image" and "at least one other [coded image] constitutes a plurality of differences based on comparison with the reference image." Thus, the attempt to combine Park with Feng is inappropriate.

Claim 11 contains the additional element of "proximity screening rules are applied by the image processing circuit." As stated before, in relation to claims 4, 6, and 12, Feng does not disclose this element, nor does it suggest it. Further, Park neither discloses this element, nor does it suggest it.

Accordingly, Claims 7, 10, and 11 are allowable over Feng in view of Park, and Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections.

In view of the above remarks, and for various other reasons, Applicants submit that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance. As such, Applicants solicit a Notice of Allowability for all claims.

Respectfully submitted,

April 9, 1999



Gary R. Stanford
Registration No. 35,689